

Comment on "High Field Quasiparticle Tunneling in $\text{Bi}_2\text{Sr}_2\text{CaCu}_2\text{O}_{8+\delta}$: Negative Magnetoresistance in the Superconducting State"

High magnetic field studies of the cuprate superconductors have revealed a non-Fermi liquid origin of the normal state resistivity [1], a negative normal state c-axis magnetoresistance [1–3], and a non-BCS shape of the upper critical field $H_{c2}(T)$ [3–5].

However, recently Morozov *et al* claimed [6] that Ref. [1,2,4] 'fell into the trap' of attributing the negative c-axis magnetoresistance above the maximum of $\rho_c(B)$ to the normal state. These authors argued that magnetoresistance in $\text{Bi}_2\text{Sr}_2\text{CaCu}_2\text{O}_{8+\delta}$ is 'controlled by the quasiparticle tunnelling in the *superconducting* state'. In this Comment we challenge their arguments.

The authors of Ref. [6] claim that while ρ_c is a measure of the interplane tunnelling, only the in-plane data could represent a true normal state and be used in the determination of H_{c2} . Their main argument comes from the apparently different field dependences of ρ_c and ρ_{ab} as shown in their Fig.2. However, ' $\rho_{ab}(B)$ ' was measured by means of contacts situated on the same face of the crystal [7]. Therefore this curve does *not* represent the in-plane resistivity because neither current redistribution (as considered in [8]) nor crystal imperfections were accounted for. We have applied the routine procedure for resistive H_{c2} evaluation [1,4] from the in- and out-of-plane data obtained on the *same* samples in [1,5]. The very similar values of $H_{c2}(T)$ obtained from ρ_{ab} and ρ_c (solid and dashed lines in the Figure) are evident. This result contradicts the argument by Morozov *et al* [6]. As to Ref.[11] of [6], different properties of the crystals used for ρ_c and ρ_{ab} measurements (i.e. 10-15K difference in T_{c0} as seen from Fig.3,4 of that reference), makes corresponding comparison meaningless.

Another finding of Ref. [6] is a non-linear c-axis I(V), attributed by the authors to a suppression of the Josephson coupling. However, a comparative analysis of the data from their Fig.2 and the inset to Fig.1 favours the Joule heating origin of the effect giving a selfconsistent estimate of an excessive heating of about 2K near the maximum of the 35K-curve in Fig.3. Moreover, although the pulse system used by them delivers 10-20 times smaller rates, dB/dt , than conventional systems, the huge size, S , of the crystal [6] essentially overwhelms this advantage since the eddy current heating is proportional to $(dB/dt)^2 S^2$. Noticeable heating with eddy currents in the crystal with a 60 times smaller S than in Ref. [6] was observed [2] below 30-40 K. That suggests significant heating effects in the low-temperature data of Ref. [6]. Indeed, clear signatures of this heating are evident from the comparison of their data for 50K and 55K in Fig.1 and 2 [6]. An *independent* test of the field dependence of the quasiparticle conductivity, shown in Fig.4 [6], suffers from the same problem. The scale of I(V) curves in the inset to Fig.4, allows us to estimate the Joule heat-

ing as $\sim 30\mu\text{W}$. Hence, heat in excess of 1000 W/cm^2 was conducted through the active $2\mu\text{m}^2$ area of the mesa depicted in Fig.4. Accounting for the poor out-of-plane thermal conductivity of BSCCO-2212, this may entail significant heating of the active area of the structure thus rising the question of the physical meaning of the measured quantities.

Finally, a linear negative longitudinal magnetoresistance has been measured by us [2,3] both below and *above* the *zero* field critical temperature, T_{c0} . Therefore, in contrast to [6], we consider the effect to be an intrinsic *normal* state property. Our view is also supported by a noticeable difference in the absolute value of the normalised magnetoresistance slope obtained on crystals with similar T_{c0} .

V.N. Zavaritsky, Kapitza Institute for Physical problems, Moscow, Russia.

M. Springford, H.H. Wills Physics Laboratory, University of Bristol, Bristol, United Kingdom.

A.S. Alexandrov, Department of Physics, Loughborough University, Loughborough, United Kingdom.

-
- [1] Y.Ando, et al., Phys.Rev. Lett. **77**, 2065 (1996).
 - [2] V.N. Zavaritsky, M. Springford, JETP Lett. **5**, 448 (1998).
 - [3] V.N. Zavaritsky, M. Springford and A.S. Alexandrov, EuroPhys. Lett. **51**, 334 (2000).
 - [4] A.S. Alexandrov *et al*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **76**, 983 (1996) and references therein.
 - [5] Y.Z. Zhang *et al*, Phys. Rev. B**61**, 8675 (2000).
 - [6] N.Morozov *et al*, Phys.Rev. Lett. **84**,1784 (2000).
 - [7] N. Morozov, private communication.
 - [8] R.Bush *et al*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **69**, 522 (1992).

